

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held \_\_\_\_\_

October 23, 2017

Page 12 of 17

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the resolution calls for a representative from the City. Has it been determined who that representative will be?

Mr. Plouck responded that it has not yet been determined, but a designee will be determined in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if this might be appropriate for CSAC to undertake. There are several great initiatives. It is not clear whether the City could designate a staff member or two individuals.

Mayor Peterson stated that this opportunity was discussed at the recent agenda discussion meeting. He recalls that Ms. Crandall was suggested as the representative. The City does have several sustainability programs.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the intent was to send a staff member. He does not believe there would be an issue if two individuals represented the City, but they will verify that. It is a good suggestion to include a CSAC member, if they are able to attend the meetings, which occur during the workday.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it appears that there will be many good ideas coming from this, which could be implemented on a number of different levels.

Mr. McDaniel responded that the opportunity would be offered to CSAC, if a member is interested and available to participate. If not, a staff member would serve as representative.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

## • **Process for Naming of the New Park at Tuller Flats on John Shields Parkway**

Mr. McDaniel noted that Council has an adopted policy for options for the process for a park naming, but Council can also designate staff to propose park names for Council's final determination. Staff will followed the direction of Council in their preference for the naming of this park.

Vice Mayor Reiner moved that staff propose names for final consideration by Council. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it has been determined that this new park would be a dog park. She believes it was reflected in some previous meeting minutes.

Mr. McDaniel responded that this park will not be a dog park.

Vice Mayor Reiner noted that the City will have a new and quite large dog park at the Glacier Ridge Metro Park.

## • **Approval of Preliminary Plat – Bridge Park, D Block**

Ms. Groomes stated that no presentation is needed, but she would like to make some comments.

- This block is where the pedestrian tunnel will land. It is adjacent to John Shields Parkway, which is ultimately planned to have a vehicular bridge across the Scioto River. She assumes that as part of that vehicular bridge, there also will be a walkway for pedestrian crossing.
- Her concern with the plat is that, in looking at the drawings, the building footprint extends all the way out to the permitted edge. By approving this plat, Council would be excluding the opportunity for any future activity to occur along John Shields Parkway.
- There will be a beautiful bridge and a pedestrian tunnel under Riverside Drive -- which will be the most used and safest route; however, these will be placed in a location where there is no street engagement whatsoever. There will be no retail shops, outdoor patios or seating, because the building footprint extends to the edge. There will be an adjacent beautiful greenway that the City will be unable to engage in a meaningful way, because there will be nothing to do in that space. She does not

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

October 23, 2017

Page 13 of 17

Held \_\_\_\_\_

believe that is what Council intended, but it is what the approval of the plat would solidify tonight.

- She believes that John Shields Parkway should be an active street, but there will be no opportunity for activity on the street level of this first block on John Shields, if Council approves these plats that will take the building all the way to the end of the buildable zone.
- She appreciates the Cap City Diner and Ram restaurant, where there is some outdoor space for various activities. Those spaces may be used for other purposes than restaurant in the future; there is the opportunity to do so because the building footprint will not be extended to the maximum edge of the building area.
- However, along John Shields Parkway, there is no opportunity for anything to happen. On the edge of that building, there are no doorways or entrances of any significance, and that streetscape is not going to be activated.
- The City will be investing \$15-20 million in another vehicular bridge across the river, and it has invested heavily in this tunnel so that our residents are able to traverse Riverside Drive in the safest manner. However, when they exit the tunnel on the east side, there will be nothing for the pedestrians to be engaged with, which falls short of Council's goal.

James Peltier, EMH&T, stated that along John Shields Parkway, the first floor of the building sits back from the property line by 15-20 feet. The second level of that building does extend to the edge of the buildable zone, which is what is depicted on the diagram. However, the first floor is held back with the intent to have patios and activate that space, particularly in the location of the underpass.

Vice Mayor Reiner asked if this would be a cantilevered second story.

Mr. Peltier responded that it would not be cantilevered; there will be columns.

Mr. Amorose Groomes stated that the space is occupied by the patio spaces of the individual condominiums or apartments that line the parking garage.

Mr. Peltier responded that the parking garage is farther east, and it is up to the property line of the greenway. At the building at the intersection with Riverside Drive, the space opens up at the first level with opportunity to activate that space.

Vice Mayor Reiner inquired about potential future uses for that space.

Mr. Peltier responded that they are attempting to secure a grocer for this space.

Ms. Alutto inquired if the space at the first level would not be utilized by resident units.

Mr. Peltier stated that the building at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive is an office building, second floor and up. The first floor will be retail and restaurant space, and outdoor dining.

Ms. Alutto inquired if that same space is intended to include open space to engage pedestrians.

Mr. Peltier stated that the John Shields Parkway open space is public, so there would be no encroachment into that space.

Vice Mayor Reiner noted that a grocer in that area could have a potential outdoor dining space. He inquired the lineal feet of the first and second floor setbacks.

Mr. Peltier responded that the second story extends to the property line, as intended, but the first floor is set back 15-20 feet from the property line.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the greenway along John Shields Parkway remains consistent to the intersection. Pedestrians will emerge from the underground tunnel at that point. The building wall extends to that point. There is no good option for activity between the east side of the tunnel entrance and the building because the pedestrians need to move around the building wall. Is the concern with the corner of Building D3, to the north?

Ms. Amorose Groomes responded that Buildings D2 and D3 are the concern.

Mr. McDaniel that the space at the first level of building, over which the second floor will extend, will provide an opportunity for engagement between the building and the

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

October 23, 2017

Page 14 of 17

Held \_\_\_\_\_

greenway. The public greenway has not yet been programmed, so there is opportunity to activate that space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the challenge of activating a greenway is to have activity adjacent to it, such as an ice cream shop, a deli, etc. It is far more difficult to activate a greenway along a solid wall than to activate a greenway that has active uses on both sides.

Mr. McDaniel stated perhaps there is opportunity for some first floor sidewalk café space next to the greenway. There is an opportunity there that has not yet been determined. He is not aware how far along the conceptual designs of the bridge are relative to how the bridge on the other side starts to engage, other than that it will carry vehicles and be walkable. He does not believe the design concepts are sufficiently advanced to determine if there is some square footage available to utilize.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated those are not the same drawings she is viewing. What she sees is a 1 to 60 scale. The greenway itself is 40 feet, which is a very healthy greenway, but immediately adjacent to the greenway, on the lawn, particularly at Building D2, is going to be a solid wall that will have no opportunity for engagement. Those will be residential units in that location -- either condominiums or apartments. That makes activating that 40-foot strip of grass difficult. The bulk of the Riverside crossing will occur at this tunnel. If she is scaling it correctly, there will be only 12-15 feet in which to have anything occur.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he believes that in moving down into that corner, the greenspace changes, so the opportunity to leverage more building could be offset by allowing more access to the greenspace. Perhaps instead of greenspace, there is hardscape, a plaza, in that location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it would appear that the intent is to figure out where and how the activity happens after everything else in place.

Mr. McDaniel stated that, in his view, if the desire is to have a lot of activity happening at the corner, it should not be greenspace, but pavers or some material that accommodates a lot of movement, a wide, not narrow, space. Is the issue one of giving up more private space to avoid using public space? In this case, more private space is better, because the building will provide more office space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her concern is not the building use. It is the planning and opportunity for the engagement.

There were no further comments.

Vice Mayor Reiner moved to approve the preliminary plat for Bridge Park, D Block.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

## STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel stated that the 2018 Operating Budget is being prepared. He has spoken to the Mayor about the possibility of presenting an introduction overview of the proposed operating budget at the November 6 Regular meeting to reduce the amount of time needed at the first budget workshop on Wednesday, November 8. The second budget workshop is scheduled for Monday, November 13. An introductory overview of the CIP budget has been provided the last couple of years in advance of the workshop. That approach appears to be helpful, if the Finance Chair is in agreement.

## COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Committee: Mr. Keenan shared that there will be a Special Meeting on Wednesday, November 1 beginning at 6 p.m. for the purpose of adjourning to executive session to interview candidates for appointment to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MORPC: Mr. Lecklider reported that the Board met on October 12. The PUCO Chairman and CEO gave a special presentation, but there were no other significant actions.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 20 of 30

Mr. Keenan moved approval of the development plan and site plan with a parking plan with the five conditions as recommended.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Mayor Peterson stated that Condition #1 indicates that all ground-mounted mechanicals located along Rock Cress Parkway will be screened along the north side. Does that mean the north side of the building or the unit?

Mr. Lecklider stated that his understanding is that the mechanicals were to be screened on three sides.

Ms. Rauch responded that is correct. However, the plans before Council tonight do not reflect this, and therefore a condition was added to make sure it was clear.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she understood that all sides of it would be screened except for the east side.

Ms. Rauch responded that was the intent, but the plans as shown at ART did not meet that. The condition is intended to make sure they fulfill this requirement. It is essentially a housekeeping provision.

Mr. Keenan accepted the amended condition #1, adding the language "of the unit."

Ms. Salay seconded the amended motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

## • **Basic Plan Review - Bridge Park D Block (Case 17-022BPR)**

Ms. Husak stated that City Council is the reviewing body for this plan, due to the applicant having a development agreement in place with the City. This comes to Council with a recommendation of approval from the Administrative Review Team on August 31. Informal review comments by the Planning and Zoning Commission are also included in the packet.

The site is located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. The proposed development plan for D Block is outlined in blue on the slide.

The first portions of Bridge Park that came before Council were Block B and Block C. Block C is, for the most part, completed; Block A is under construction, and the PZC recently had an informal review of the last building within that block, which is the office building – A-1. Block H to the east of Block D is also under construction, and it is immediately adjacent to Block D. Block D is bounded by John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. As part of this development, the applicant is creating three blocks as well as the extension of two public streets. Larimer Street is being extended from Block H toward Longshore Drive. These are both public streets that provided a north/south connection from John Shields Parkway to Tuller Ridge Drive.

There is one waiver associated with the development plan that relates to the length of this block, due to Larimer Street not extending to Riverside Drive. This was driven by the desire not to have interruptions along that roadway. The length of the block exceeds what the Code would permit.

Building D-1 is a mixed-use building type of six stories, including retail and restaurant on the first floor; office on the second floor; and 44 units for sale within the building. There is also a proposed pedestrian bridge that would extend to the east to provide access to Building D-4 and D-5. This will also provide parking for this building.

The ART approved an administrative departure to allow the story of the main floor to be taller than what Code would allow.

The waiver requested is for the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the right-of-way for Longshore, as well as for the building to be six stories in height.

The applicant has provided inspirational images for that particular building, which is intended to be more of a warehouse, modern style architecture.

Building D-2 is the building that anchors the block on the north side, immediately adjacent to John Shields Parkway. It is a corridor building type with six stories in height.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 21 of 30

It includes retail on the first floor, and office on floors 2 to 6. There is also an outdoor terrace proposed on the sixth floor. Staff has been working with the applicant throughout the review of this portion of the application to ensure there is ample room where it is adjacent to the greenway at John Shields Parkway as well as the bridge access to go below Riverside Drive for pedestrians.

A waiver is requested as part of this building, which relates to the front property line coverage that is required to be 95 percent. Due to the shape of the building, the pedestrian tunnel and the infrastructure in place today, the applicant can provide 83 percent of that requirement.

The architecture for each of the buildings will become more formal as the final site plan moves forward. The idea is to provide some type of juxtaposition to the AC Hotel on the opposite side of Bridge Park.

Moving to the east, D-3 is a corridor type building of five stories in height with a parking structure in the center. The applicant is showing a small tenant space of about 1,000 square feet with a drive through – essentially, planning ahead if development in a retail business were to occur in the D-2 building, it could be serviced through an additional tenant area within this building.

There are 76 dwelling units lining the space on floors 2 through 5; there is a terrace in the building for open space amenities for residents; and there is a pedestrian bridge connecting the adjacent building.

There are two administrative departures approved by ART and they relate to lot coverage and ground story height.

There are waivers requested for this building, which address incompatible building types, as H Block to the east is a residential building and there are Code requirements that indicate that a corridor building should not be adjacent to a residential building. The applicant will provide architectural detailing that will make that not incompatible, as they work through the requirements.

The other waiver is for parking within the building, which is proposed to be in the ground story. This will require additional excavating. Due to the grade, a waiver is required and is supported by ART and staff.

There is a lot of movement up going to the east within this particular block.

She shared images for this building, which include a modern design with glass and masonry.

Building D-4 and D-5 is one building, with two building types. It is a corridor building and a parking structure, five stories in height, with the potential for retail on the first floor; 85 parking spaces on that floor; and 552 parking spaces throughout the rest of the building, with residential liners. The applicant is providing parking for the office building within this building as well as for Building D-1 for the residences there. A ground story height administrative departure was approved by ART for this building.

This building also includes pool and outdoor space on the top floor for residents within all of Bridge Park.

The waivers requested for this building are the incompatible building type due to the residences in H Block to the east; the encroachment for the pedestrian bridges over the rights-of-way, as have occurred in previously approved developments within Bridge Park; and lot coverage, to make the most out of the building and parking. There is a request for lot coverage to be at 90 percent.

Overall, there is approximately an acre of open space required per the Code for this particular building. The applicant is providing three publicly accessible open spaces – the John Shields Parkway greenway, as well as the open space between the two buildings that front Riverside Drive. There are privately accessible open spaces in Buildings D-3 and the pool and amenity deck in Buildings D-4, D5. The applicant will be required to pay a fee in lieu of the open space that is not included within this development, should the development be approved by the reviewing body. The deficit is minimal – ½ acre or less.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 22 of 30

Three motions are required on this application: a motion to approve the nine waivers; a motion to approve the basic plan itself, with four conditions as recommended by ART; and a motion to designate the future required reviewing body for this application. This would include any future kind of application the applicant is subjected to – whether it is a conditional use, a parking plan, fee in lieu of open space, and the final site/final development plans.

She offered to respond to questions, noting the applicant and their team are present as well.

Mayor Peterson asked if Buildings D-1, D-2 and D-3 were always contemplated as six stories in height.

Ms. Husak responded they were not. In the staff review of the application, they encouraged the applicant to look at the height specifically in this particular area where D-2 is located. There is an eight-story building on the south end and a taller building on that end as well. What changed is that there was more office space requested in the area, and that drove the desire for an additional story for this building, as well.

Mayor Peterson noted that he recalls there was an expectation of a grocery store coming in one of these buildings. He does not see that a grocery store is included.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners stated that they have been working on a grocery for this block since the outset. The grocery market, in general, is in turmoil with the Amazon entry into that market. Amazon groceries are 3,000 square feet, while traditional grocery stores are 120,000 square feet. They had considered a large-scale, more traditional grocer from the outset, and this building was to extend all the way across Longshore, creating a wall along the greenway. There was also a loading dock, backing onto Mooney Street across from the condos. They felt it was necessary to provide a grocer in this development under the previous thinking. With a large-scale grocery not likely, it provided an opportunity to review the plan. Longshore now continues all the way through to the greenway, although it was initially to turn down to interrupt the block length. There were engineering issues, and concern with people weaving in to cross the John Shields Parkway bridge. The result is opening up a nice view corridor through there. Moving to a smaller format grocery store is now the plan. They have now identified this retail space, and it will work for multiple grocery tenants. The garage in D-3 has an area completely screened from the outside for a potential pharmacy drive-through. Some tenants require a pharmacy as a critical part of their profit margin, and they will not sign a lease without a pharmacy drive-through. There is a lot of grade change along John Shields Parkway of 15 feet. That parking garage quickly is buried as one goes up the hill. At the top of the hill, facing the condominium building is a four-story stick apartment building facing a three or four-story stick condominium building directly across the street. While this is a waiver being requested tonight, it is really residential across from residential. It is a good cohabitation of two different building types located directly across from each other. The changes in the market have brought some positive changes to their plan, breaking the scale of the buildings down in D Block. It enables pulling building D-2 out as a pure office building, adding some height to it, making it more exciting, bookending what is happening with the AC Marriott. Then focus the residential and parking in Building D-3 right behind it, plus the grocery.

Mayor Peterson noted that the extra floor planned is therefore to accommodate more office space versus more apartment space. His point is that the buildings are getting larger, and wider and taller – the concern would be with packing more apartments into the plans.

Mr. Yoder responded it is the exact opposite. They are looking at 112,000 square feet of office running on Riverside Drive. They originally had 43 condos over ground floor retail. Due to the amount of office, they added office and stretched the building height. To do that, they are going to a more extensive wood construction type, just shy of 85 feet tall versus 75 feet as on the other blocks. They now have office use on the river. The owner-occupied will face Riverside Drive and the river. Building D-2 is an office building similar to the Crawford Hoying office building, with ground floor retail and five stories of

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

September 11, 2017

Page 23 of 30

office above. There will be a nice bookend feeling with the office building on one end and the AC Marriott on the other end.

Mayor Peterson stated that the units are referred to as living units. Are all condos owner occupied or are there apartments included?

Mr. Yoder responded that there are apartments sprinkled in as well. The units facing and on the river in Building D-1 are all owner-occupied units. The entire building is owner-occupied. There are eight units in that building that face Longshore and are all owner-occupied as well. The larger condominium of 2,200-2,500 square feet all have river views; and there are 1,400 square feet flats in the back that face Longshore. There are 76 apartments sprinkled in Building D-2. There are about the same number of units over by the parking garage. They are looking at the units lining the garage as going to condominium, but a decision has not been made. The H Block buildings directly behind are townhome condos, and the foundations will be started on Wednesday.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that it is interesting that more office space is being included.

Mr. Yoder responded that now that the critical mass and restaurants are at the gate, the living spaces created for the employees and the environment that exists at Bridge Park, office users want to be on the site. They will be in front of PZC on November 2 for an 80,000 square foot office building located at the corner of Riverside Drive and SR161; that is an A Block office building. There will be another 112,000 square feet of office in E Block.

Mr. Keenan inquired if some of that office will be condominiums.

Mr. Yoder responded that at this point, the office space is not condominiums. The condos are all residential.

Ms. Amorose Groomes:

1. The 43 units in D1 are all condominiums. There are 175 units overall, so the balance are all apartments.

Mr. Yoder indicated that was correct.

2. The block immediately to the north of D block -- D2, is referred to as a bookend, but there really is another block to go in the District before reaching Tuller Road. Is there an indication of what is planned there?

Mr. Yoder responded that Al Vrable owns that land, and currently, he is not willing to develop it. They have spoken to him about expanding the project to the north, and discussions are ongoing. Whether or not that develops, the bridge across John Shields Parkway will provide a frame between that roadway and SR 161. Creating this visual composition between the two bridges makes sense. If something eventually occurs on the other side, it can also be made to fit.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the developer of that next parcel might feel differently about where the bookend belongs.

3. There are problems with making Buildings D1 and D2 six stories. The staff report states that because it sits low, it will not appear bigger than the building immediately to the east. She does not know if the view will be palatable from Riverside Drive, which is where the public will experience that height. Just because there is an office user for a building does not mean that the building should necessarily get taller. Perhaps there could be three stories of residential, retail on the bottom and office on the second floor rather than just making the building larger in general.

Mr. Yoder stated that they are already on the small side of a condo development. In this case, they would simply remove the office use. If height is a major concern, that would be their response. Removing a floor of the office building would actually make the office building less expensive. They could do that. They had assumed the City would appreciate addition of office space to the project, but if that is not the case, it can be eliminated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Code and the vision for this space are the controlling factors. She understands why they proposed the additional office space, but she does not see a compelling reason to abandon the Code.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

September 11, 2017

Page 24 of 30

Held \_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Husak clarified that D2 is permitted to be six stories. The requested waiver for the additional story is for Building D1.

Mr. Yoder stated that a six-story height was approved for the entire Riverside neighborhood. He does not know if the building type is a factor.

Ms. Husak stated that the D2 building is the corridor building type, which is permitted to be a maximum of six stories. The mixed-use, D1 building has a five-story maximum height.

Mr. Yoder inquired if it would be possible to make the D1 a corridor building.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a possibility, but would have to be evaluated to ensure that would not create other issues.

Mr. Yoder noted that Buildings B1 and B2 are mixed-use with ground-floor retail, second floor office and four floors of residential above.

Ms. Husak stated that discussions with the applicant have focused on the desire to create something that was not generic in this location. There was an effort to set this block apart from what is present in Buildings C and B, a similar building type and height in a very arranged pattern. This Block was intended to create a break from that pattern and add more interest. On that basis, staff and ART looked at this as an approvable waiver.

Mr. Yoder stated that they started with the design used for the five-story building – ground story retail and four stories of condominiums above. When the design was changed to add the additional office height, the building proportions and appearance significantly improved. The aesthetics of the building improved and it adds office space for the City. Perhaps there is an alternate way to handle the building type and avoid the need for a waiver. They would prefer not to defer this, however. The building stands on its own merits to justify a waiver tonight, and they can look for a way to eliminate the need for a waiver before Final Development review.

Ms. Amorose Grooms inquired as to the ART granting an administrative departure for lot coverage on Buildings D4-5.

Ms. Husak clarified that it was Building D-3.

Ms. Amorose Grooms clarified that it was Building 3 that had ART approval for 90% lot coverage.

Ms. Husak stated it was actually 88% from 80%.

Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver for D4-5, which is the parking garage, from 80% to 90%. Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that these two adjacent buildings will have lot coverage in excess of what code permits.

Ms. Husak stated that was correct.

Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that she has a few concerns regarding the D3, D4-5 buildings. The first concern is there are no compatible uses across the street from these buildings. She stated that she understands that this is one of the waivers being requested, but she wanted to know what is being done to mitigate that impact. She is concerned they will have a negative impact on the townhomes being built.

Mr. Yoder stated that it is across the street from a four-story residential. They are similar architecture and the current design has done everything to transition from owner-occupied to residential.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked for clarification on the waiver for incompatible uses.

Ms. Husak stated that the applicant has to pick a building type and the building type picked is considered incompatible in the Code.

Ms. Amorose Grooms clarified that a portion of D3 along Mooney Street on the ground floor is residential.

Ms. Husak stated that was true.

In response to Ms. Amorose Grooms' question regarding access, Ms. Husak stated the access is from the interior.

Mr. Yoder stated there are porches so there can be interaction with Mooney Street, but no access.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

September 11, 2017

Page 25 of 30

Held \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Lecklider inquired as to whether or not the building heights presented at this meeting were the same building heights presented to Planning and Zoning Commission at the informal review.

Mr. Yoder stated they were exactly the same and the reception was very positive.

Mayor Reiner complimented Mr. Yoder on the change in architecture. He believes it will be an improvement to the overall façade of the street. He stated that he understands the waivers that are being requested.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired as to what the ceiling heights will be if the waiver is for a ten-foot height floor to floor.

Mr. Yoder stated that the ceilings would be nine-foot ceilings. The waiver being discussed is actually for the garage where there were some smaller spaces with lower ceilings created.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired about the overall 749 parking spaces being created and how many of those would be dedicated to the apartments and condominiums.

Mr. Yoder stated that the condos will have two spaces per unit bringing the total to 86. The apartments will be allowed one space per unit and the balance will be shared by office, retail, etc. He is confident that there are the right number of spaces. The condos will have a gated access to their part of the garage, but the apartment users will share with the office and retail.

In response to Ms. Amorose Groomes' question regarding the apartment spaces, Mr. Yoder stated that the upper floors would be dedicated to the apartment users. The space will be marked by a sign stating that it is reserved.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired as to how many spaces are assigned 24 hours per day. Mr. Yoder stated that one space per apartment and two spaces per condo unit; 216 of the 749 spaces are dedicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there are 533 spaces left for office users and retail.

Mr. Yoder stated that those numbers do not include the on-street parking.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there has been a lot of pressure regarding traffic in the area and in the roundabout, and they have been trying to address those problems with signage and markings. The development that requires this level of parking poses a problem because the traffic study assumed a 40% capture rate. When this level of parking demand comes in, it is concerning that there will be more people traveling by automobile than the traffic study initially contemplated. It is Council's responsibility to make sure that the development is sustainable from a traffic impact standpoint.

Mr. Yoder stated that construction on the Bridge Park extension to Sawmill Road will begin September 18, and it will be open by the end of the year. This will be a completely new road running parallel to SR 161.

Ms. Salay stated that Council has always expressed their support of higher density in this area, so it is up to the City to complete the traffic network in partnership with the developers.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the PZC minutes reference the use of the swimming pool on the fifth floor. Therefore, someone who lives elsewhere in the community is able to drive up to the fifth floor, park on the fifth level and walk through a gate to the pool. She believes this is the antithesis of what the City is trying to develop as urban and walkable. The traffic study certainly did not contemplate those uses. She is concerned about whether the kind of development the City is doing meets the capture rate of the traffic study.

Mr. Yoder stated that he works in Bridge Park during business hours all week, eats at Bridge Park, works out at Mesh and does not have to leave during the day. He believes that lifestyle will continue to build.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 26 of 30

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her final issue relates to lot coverage and bumping the allowable 80% up to 88% and 90%. She spoke of her experience having dinner and what made this a welcoming pedestrian area is what Cap City has done on the exterior of the building. Her concern is that the City is losing the ability to have those kinds of spaces by having the building occupy all the buildable area. There are no spaces remaining for relief along the streetscape. The feel of the buildings from the street level is very massive, and the best way to break that up is for those kinds of uses on the exterior. She asked Ms. Husak what the options would be for relief at the ground level. Ms. Husak stated that the City has requirements for buildings being close to the street, with front property line coverage. If you maximize those areas, the lot coverage increases.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she believes these were more like cafeteria items and the answer to this question was basically, "yes, we like all of them."

Mr. Yoder stated regarding the area that Cap City has created that there are spaces designed for both tenants on each side of the open space. He stated that indoor/outdoor space can be created in other unique ways.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the 90% coverage means the City loses a significant amount of open space.

Mr. Yoder stated that grass can be planted in that open space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted on a drawing provided the areas marked for park space and inquired as to whether that counted toward the 10% or was it part of their open space requirements.

Ms. Husak responded that the space where the waiver was requested is in a different block. The Code does not state that the remaining percent could not double as park and open space to fill that requirement also. The 10% remaining that Ms. Amorose Groomes is inquiring about does not have a green space associated with it that would be dedicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she noticed some of the dedications are on Riverside Drive on City-owned land, so she assumes that would be fee in lieu of parkland donation, and that would be the portion their fee would be attributed to.

Ms. Husak stated it is almost both. If there is open space existing within a certain distance of a development, the developer may be able to use that open space to fulfill their requirement. However, a fee in lieu of dedication is still required for what is not being provided.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested clarification for a drawing of the building where the waiver was requested.

Ms. Husak illustrated on the drawing the building that had a waiver request for 90% lot coverage.

In response to Ms. Amorose Groomes' question regarding the available options, Mr. Yoder stated there is a .3-acre space that they would like to make into a dog park that would be all green space. They are working with MKSK to improve the area and make an off-leash dog park area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that these buildings are massive and she would like to know what options are available to provide some relief at the ground floor level with a 90% lot coverage.

Ms. Alutto stated that there is no green space at C4-5 and D4-5. Visually, there are two massive buildings and nothing else.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there may not be anything that can be done, given the 90% lot coverage.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 27 of 30

Ms. Husak stated that the 10% open space would not be impactful. The applicant has provided meaningful exterior open space accessible to the public and interior to the building for the residents.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she is concerned about the pedestrian experience. Mr. Yoder stated that if one looks at the whole area in context, there is a beautiful open space in the park area.

Ms. Salay stated that in looking at only this site, the 90% could be objectionable; however, looking at it in context as a whole, it does make sense. Mr. Lecklider agreed.

Vice Mayor Reiner asked if there will be bicycle parking. Mr. Yoder responded there is secured bicycle parking within the garages for residents and for the public.

Mayor Peterson asked whether there will be more establishments with outside areas such as those at Cap City and Ram.

Mr. Yoder stated they are encouraging establishments to include these features because it adds to the experience.

In response to Mayor Peterson's question, Mr. Yoder stated they estimate between 12-15 restaurants will be developed in total.

Mayor Peterson reiterated Ms. Amorose Groomes' point about the outdoor spaces and that this is what the City is looking for.

Mr. Yoder stated he understood.

Mayor Peterson clarified that the 90% in this one block area does not necessarily prevent having more outdoor space attractions.

Mr. Yoder stated that is correct.

Mr. Yoder also stated that he agrees with Ms. Salay and that the high quality, well-executed open spaces that are within this development are something not usually seen in cities.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested a particular drawing be displayed so she could clarify her point. The Ram outdoor dining is in this portion of the buildable area that was not built on. With 90 percent lot coverage, these are not possible for other establishments. Ms. Husak stated that it is more about the usage of the building than the lot coverage.

Mr. Yoder pointed out the residential condos and the storefronts on the drawing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there was not anything to break up the massing of the buildings.

Mr. Yoder stated there will be storefronts, with awnings and such.

Ms. Salay moved to approve the nine waivers.

Vice Mayor Reiner seconded the motion.

A procedural question arose about the vote on the waivers.

Ms. Readler responded that Council can separate the waivers if Council desires to vote on them individually. However, the motion currently on the floor is for approval of all nine waivers as requested.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the basic plan with the four conditions as listed.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

September 11, 2017

Page 28 of 30

Mayor Peterson moved to designate Planning and Zoning Commission as the reviewing body for future development applications for Block D.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes.

- **Aging in Place – Strategic Plan**

Ms. Crandall stated that presented for Council consideration tonight is an Aging in Place Strategic Plan. Council had the opportunity to preview this plan last year during a Council workshop, and at that time, referred the plan to the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) for further review. Over the course of several months, the Commission heard from a variety of guest speakers with expertise related to this topic. Presenters included representatives of Ohio University's College of Health Science and Professions, Syntero and the Central Ohio Agency on Aging. In Council's packet is a redlined version of the plan that shows the Commission's recommended changes. Present tonight are Mindy Carr, CSAC Chair and Ann Bohman, CSAC member.

Ms. Carr thanked Council for giving CSAC the opportunity to review the plan. These are the types of projects they enjoy reviewing. They found the plan to be well thought out and comprehensive. After review, CSAC has recommended a few changes. In the plan, several themes are covered that they would like to highlight to raise their level of priority in addressing current and future service gaps related to aging in place. These are as follows:

- Establishment of an Information and Assistance "One-Stop-Shop" – Both older adults and their caregivers can find it difficult to be aware of, locate and understand services and programs that may be available. Having one place or point of contact to navigate services and programs should be explored and options determined to address this issue. Several agencies provide services directly to the caregivers, even though they may not live in the same area as the older adult.
- Co-location of Services – Closely related to the idea of a one-stop-shop is the co-location of certain services, if possible, such as Central Ohio Area Agency on Aging and Syntero (Dublin Counseling Center) to have conveniently located "case managers" from each agency. Both agencies currently provide older adult services and could cross-refer individuals when appropriate. Ohio University has expressed interest in working with the City to explore this idea as their campus and adult focused health/wellness programming continues to expand. The City could facilitate this process and provide links at the City website.
- Solving the Transportation Gap - Older adults who are no longer able to drive face great challenges to access basic needed services as well as social and civic opportunities. Isolation can be devastating to physical, behavioral and emotional health. Identifying those in need and ensuring accessible and affordable options are available for all types of transportation needs throughout the City, including to socially/civically engage and volunteer, is critical. CSAC is aware that there is a Mobility Study in progress, and they look forward to reviewing those recommendations, as well, to determine if they might help with this need.
- Establishing a Village-to-Village Program - These programs connect residents in need with those willing to assist. This could entail a significant expansion of the City's trial "Yard Squad" program to facilitate a variety of needed connections. There could possibly be a need for a non-profit to be formed to manage that program.
- Partnerships are Imperative – The City is not the expert when it comes to many of the service and educational gaps. Multiple agencies exist in Dublin and central Ohio that are the experts and are already providing the needed services. The City



## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 7, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703  
Preliminary Plat**

**Proposal:** The subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000-square-feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure.

**Location:** Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway.

**Request:** Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

**Applicant:** Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying.

**Planning Contact:** Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager.

**Contact Information:** (614) 410-4675, [chusak@dublin.oh.us](mailto:chusak@dublin.oh.us)

**Case Information:** <http://dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-022>

**MOTION:** Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Preliminary Plat because it is consistent with all of the applicable review criteria and the Subdivision Regulations, with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

\*Nelson Yoder agreed to the above condition.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** This Preliminary Plat will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

Claudia D. Husak, AICP  
Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager



~~Victoria Newell said overall she liked the building and the massing but there are little things that do not sit well with her. She said she is not comfortable with the canopy entry as it just feels tacked onto the building and not really integrated into the design. She said the entry should be pulling us into the space. She noted that on the east, west, and north sides there is a nice play of metal panels on the building but they are not on the south elevation. She said this end should be the most prominent view and yet it was not interesting. She concluded by checking the discussion questions to make sure the Commission had covered them all.~~

~~Mr. Brown reinforced the north elevation and how it integrates with the neighborhood. Mr. Yoder reported that boulders are being placed right now.~~

~~Mr. Yoder concluded he received great feedback.~~

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703  
Preliminary Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and a public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000 square feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there was one condition of approval and asked if the applicant had agreed to the condition as follows:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Claudia Husak reported this is a standard condition to which the applicant had agreed.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for approval 7 – 0)

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Claudia Husak said Vince Papsidero and several Planners will be attending the ULI awards dinner.

~~Ms. Husak said she brought copies of the application for the Insight 2050 Academy that MORPC facilitates. She explained this would be a commitment for three evenings (Tuesdays) in October for a nominal fee, which the City would cover, if anyone is interested; the application needs to be submitted to MORPC by September 25<sup>th</sup>.~~

~~Ms. Husak said the packets are being moved to the OneDrive platform that is available on a mobile device as well as a desktop. She said there will be dual meeting packets – in Dropbox as before but also now in OneDrive for two meetings as a test run and then go live with just OneDrive. She asked the~~